

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

23rd Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIII, No. 17

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© November 1, 1993

Science Budgets Lag In Clinton Technology Boom

With the Congressional session winding down, the final budget outcomes total up to a boom year for government promotion of civilian industrial technology and a fairly drab one for academic science. Add in the political crash of the Superconducting Super Collider and NASA's various mishaps in the space sciences, and 1993 heads for the record books as one of the worst ever for the postwar scientific enterprise.

The shift toward industrial R&D got under way haltingly during the last two years of the Bush Administration. Clinton's emphasis on economic revival served to accelerate it, Congressional Democrats, as ever, were eager to collaborate in promoting industry, and the process has been gaining momentum.

The fastest-growing agency in the federal R&D lineup is

Oratorical Gems in SSC Debate—P.5 SGR Stirs Psychiatric Assoc.—P.6

a previously obscure, industrially oriented organization that has rapidly acquired economic chic: the National Institute of Standards and Technology. NIST is still a pygmy among the giants of federal research and development, but none of them can match the pace of NIST's budget expansion, from \$384 million in the last fiscal year to \$520 million this year. The shift in priorities, however, is even bigger than the numbers suggest.

Within the current NIST budget, the biggest gainer is the industrial-outreach program mandated by Congress in 1988 when it created NIST from the venerable but humble National Bureau of Standards. Visions of Japan's MITI and European ministries of industry and technology inspired the legislators as they sought to engage the US government in promotion of high-tech civilian industry. NIST was their baby. Ignored by Reagan and initially regarded by Bush as a misbegotten venture into industrial policy, the new missions that Congress grafted onto the old agency had a difficult infancy. But under Clinton, they're robust, up, and running.

The main instrument for outreach by NIST is the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), which organizes and subsidizes consortia of industrial firms confronted by technologically daunting common problems. As proposed by Clinton and approved by Congress, the ATP budget has soared from

(Continued on Page 3)

Agriculture Science Post Gets Zoe Baird Treatment

Zoe Baird, Kimba Wood, Lani Guinier. Now, there's a new name on the list of citizens publicly designated by the Clinton White House for high federal office, and then shamelessly abandoned: Luis Sequeira, former Professor of Plant Pathology and Bacteriology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Left dangling for two months after Clinton said he was the choice for Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Science and Education, Sequeira has withdrawn his name, with open expressions of dismay at the miserable, unexplained ordeal that he has experienced.

A distinguished researcher, and a member of the Na-

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

NSF will have some extra money for building and renovating academic labs this year, thanks to a spurt of Congressional generosity which provided \$100 million for facilities. The White House asked for only \$55 million, about the same as last year's figure.

The NSF budget also includes \$1 million for the National Academy of Sciences "to undertake a comprehensive and independent review of the role and position of space science within NASA." The initiative comes from NSF's Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which expressed support for creation of an NIH-style institute for space science. The Subcommittee is chaired by Senator Barbara Mikulski of Maryland, home of the Goddard Space Flight Center.

The US-Mexico Foundation for Science, founded two years ago with a kitty of \$2 million from each government, has awarded its first grants, \$50,000 per year for two years for 12 projects, each involving a scientist in the US and one in Mexico. The disciplines involved are chemistry, engineering, environment, health, and social sciences. For information about the next round: Jill Conley, Board on Science and Technology for International Development, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-3030.

Stirred by reports that Congress doesn't realize that NIH money underpins a lot of research for which universities reap public credit, Frank Fitch, President of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, has asked editors of a flock of scientific journals to request authors of research papers and news reports to tell who paid the bills.

... Rumors Say Shalala Blackballed Appointment

(Continued from Page 1)

tional Academy of Sciences since 1980, Sequeira was the choice for the top research-administration job in the US Department of Agriculture, according to a White House announcement of "intention to nominate" issued in August. Sequeira knows the Department, and it knows him, since he headed USDA's competitive research grants program in 1984-85 and served again in the Department as a senior scientist in 1988. But after the White House announcement, he heard nothing more, except that—as he told SGR last week—"there was opposition at the level of the White House."

Unable to get an explanation or an assurance that his nomination would proceed, Sequeira called it quits last month. "There was veiled opposition," he said. "I don't know where it was coming from. When I called, I got a runaround." He described his experience as "difficult and disappointing," adding that it has been "very disruptive" for his personal and professional life.

The source of the opposition has never surfaced. But Sequeira told SGR that he's heard rumors—they've been circulating in Washington—that his nomination was blackballed by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, with whom Sequeira clashed while Shalala was Chancellor of the Wisconsin campus. Shalala has nothing to do with the Department of Agriculture, and, furthermore, is rated one of the weakest members of the Clinton cabinet. But the capital's power trackers note that Shalala was a pre-Presidential buddy of Hillary Rodham Clinton.

A veteran agricultural specialist on Capitol Hill told SGR that Sequeira was dumped "because he crossed Shalala." The two of them, he said, were involved in "an old pissing contest and she went to the White House."

Emphasizing that he doesn't know what blocked his nomination, Sequeira told SGR that he opposed Shalala's support for a speech code on the Wisconsin campus and also challenged her claims of low administrative costs.

"All this was well known when I was approached for the job," which was back in March, Sequeira told SGR. After saying he would accept the job if offered, Sequeira heard nothing more until August, when the White House announced that the President intended to nominate him.

A standard step along the lengthy, paper-laden route to Presidentially appointed office, the announcement of intention to nominate tells the world that a candidate has been selected. The next step, which can take months, is the delivery of a formal nomination to the Senate, along with an FBI report and voluminous details about personal finances. To provide a head start while the process proceeds, the nominee is usually signed on as a consultant, and functions unofficially as the shadow chief of the agency. "But they wouldn't let me work as a consultant," Sequeira told SGR, despite his frequent requests for that status and expressions of puzzlement when they were ignored.

"I needed to get to Washington on a temporary appointment," he told SGR, "but I couldn't get them to give me the appointment."

Sequeira said he had conversations with the personnel office at the Department and with the Acting Head of the office he expected to fill, R.D. Plowman. "When I called, I was told to be patient," he said. He said he was assured that he had the support of Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy, though he said he never had a conversation with Espy, and he doesn't know whether Espy went to bat in support of his appointment.

Nonetheless, assuming that his nomination remained on track, Sequeira, age 66, resigned from the University at the end of August and also severed several consulting assignments and other business relationships to satisfy federal conflict-of-interest regulations. "I was ready to go September 1. I had plane reservations right after Labor Day." And he had been apartment hunting in Washington.

After September passed without any sign about his fate, Sequeira said, "I didn't want to play the game." Early in October, with Washington still giving him the cold shoulder, he sent word that he was no longer interested in the job. SGR's inquiries at the Department about Sequeira's status have elicited apparently embarrassed silences, followed by assurances of call-backs that never came.

Occurring in the obscure recesses of the US Department of Agriculture, which ranks low in press attention, Sequeira's experience hasn't attained the notoriety of Clinton's previous abandonments, but it's of the same order, and involves the same play-it-safe tactic that the White House has employed with other appointments: hang 'em up for public view and see who gets mad. If it's politically advantageous to have the candidate walk the plank, so be it.

With responsibility for a broad array of agencies whose combined budgets exceed \$1 billion, the job of Assistant Secretary for Science and Education is the premier position in federal support of agricultural research, and is destined for even broader responsibilities under a Departmental reorganization plan (see Page 4).

Now, one year after Clinton's election, the post is still vacant.—DSG

© 1993, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$425.00 (two years, \$730.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

... Nearly Half of NIST Budget in Outreach Programs

(Continued from Page 1)

\$68 million last year to \$199.5 million this year. A companion program of Manufacturing Extension Services, designed to provide technical assistance for small firms, went from \$18 million to \$30 million.

The industrial-outreach programs will account for close to half of NIST's spending this year. The White House has been warning other agencies to plan for austerity for at least the next few years, but even more budget growth has been charted for NIST.

Meanwhile, budget doldrums have descended upon the two mainline agencies for basic research, the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. NIH, which lived on \$10.3 billion last year, came out of Congress with a \$630 million increase for this year. But that's only because NIH's friends on Capitol Hill overrode Clinton's request for a mere \$211 million increase. It's an old tradition for the White House to propose a small increase for NIH in anticipation of Congress enacting a larger one. The pattern endures, but the scale of the increases has been declining.

The Congressional figure is about enough to keep up with the biomedical rate of inflation, but insufficient to satisfy the frustrated yearnings from many lean years in the biomedical community at large and on the Bethesda campus. The woeful aspect of it for NIH and its clients is that the future doesn't look any brighter.

Discretionary federal spending—in which NIH shares—is bound to remain under severe pressure for at least the next few years, as Congress and the White House and Democrats and Republicans compete in the profitable politics of deficit bashing. In a federal budget of \$1.2 trillion, there's always room for special cases. Industrial research is one of them. So far, basic science is not. And there are no signs of a change in thinking at the White House.

In recognition of NIH's dim fiscal prospects, Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa), Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for NIH, has proposed a kind of tax on national health care for the benefit of biomedical research. In its Appropriations report, Harkin's Subcommittee asserts that "a cure is the ultimate in cost control" and adds that "an aggressive medical research program must be included in legislation to reform our health care system as a central mechanism for controlling the costs of health care in this country."

Recommending "establishment of a medical research trust fund to augment Federal appropriations for the biomedical enterprise supported by the National Institutes of Health," the report states, "Mechanisms for generating these funds could take several forms, including a national income tax checkoff or a monthly set-aside from health care premiums."

Sympathetic mumbles about the financial needs of biomedical research have ensued from various senior Administration officials, including Health and Human Services Sec-

retary Donna Shalala and Laura D'Andrea Tyson, head of the Council of Economic Advisers. But on the tender issue of assisting biomedical research with additional taxes or charges on health-care premiums, an understandable silence reigns. The draft plan of the Clintons' working group on health-care reform stresses prevention in its brief discussion of biomedical research.

NSF received an early sign of favor from the White House when Clinton included \$207 million for the Foundation in his \$16 billion economic stimulus package in February. But when a Senate filibuster stranded the whole proposal, the money for NSF was not among the few items that Clinton sought to salvage.

As part of the regular, annual budget process, NSF subsequently went to Congress hopefully bearing Clinton's request for a 16 percent increase, which would have raised its budget for this year to \$3 billion. Congress held the increase to a disappointing, though respectable, 10 percent.

If matters had been left there, NSF would rank among the fortunate few in substantial budget gains this year. But the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the Foundation, chaired by Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.), also fired off heavy salvos of policy dictates that severely rattled the politically timid organization [SGR, October 1].

Declaring that NSF "is at a crossroads in its future," the Subcommittee report threateningly stated that "the Foundation can be at the heart of helping to shape the administration's science and technology policy in pursuit of specific national goals, or it can diminish into becoming nothing more than a national endowment for science."

The difference between a foundation and an endowment was not spelled out, but the best-known endowments run by the US government, for the Arts and the Humanities, currently operate on less than \$200 million a year each.

With schools and universities throughout the country clamoring for NSF funds, there's no chance of a severe cutback in its budget. But Appropriations Subcommittees wield enormous influence, and the messages they write into their annual reports, though not legally binding, are accorded great respect by executive agencies. Even if the prose in an appropriations report is somewhat opaque, as is the case with the sermon delivered to NSF, the thrust of the message is nonetheless discernable.

Mikulski's report stated, "It is time for the Foundation to move beyond rhetorical statements about the value of strategic research or the importance of using science for the transfer of knowledge and technology. That, in the Committee's view," it continued, "is a fact of life and political reality."

NSF, the report said, should "set specific performance milestones for Federal critical technology programs." And then a final warning: "If the NSF and its constituent members choose not to do this, future Federal R&D budgets should

(Continued on Page 4)

Land Grant Schools Wary of USDA Reorganization

Plans for consolidating the administration of science and education programs and economic services in the US Department of Agriculture have aroused fears among USDA's academic beneficiaries.

Concerns of ending up on the losing end of budget shortages were raised at a Congressional hearing October 13 by Rodney Foil, head of the Committee of Academic Heads of Agriculture of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Testifying before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations and Nutrition, Foil warned that "the university system might be disadvantaged when times become tough, as we know they will, and decisions have to be made as to whether to fund the line agency, the full-time employees of the government, or to support the partnership programs [with universities] throughout the nation."

Under an Administration reorganization plan that extends through the entire Department of Agriculture, two current slots at the Assistant Secretary level—for Economics and for Science and Education—would be rolled into one, with the title of Assistant Secretary for Research and Economics. The new Assistant Secretary would head a new organization within the Department, the Agricultural Research and Education Service, an amalgamation of many diverse units: the Agricultural Research Service (the inhouse arm of USDA research), the Cooperative State Research Service, the Extension Service, the National Agricultural Library, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, and economics functions under what would be called the Agricultural Economics Service.

Foil indicated that the land-grant community would feel more comfortable if "Education" were appended to the proposed title of Assistant Secretary for Research and Economics.

In an October 6 report analyzing the overall reorganization plan for USDA, the Congressional Research Service (CRS) observed that previous plans have come and gone with little effect and "whether Secretary Espy, even with Congressional support, can attain an objective that has proven elusive to many past Secretaries of Agriculture remains to be seen."

The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1993 (HR 3171), conferring wide-ranging authority on the Secretary of Agriculture, was introduced on September 29 by Rep. Kika de la Garza, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Study Faults NIH Management

Fiscal management and controls at the National Institutes of Health are a mess, according to a report prepared by the Price Waterhouse accounting firm for the Inspector General's Office at the Department of Health and Human Services.

Titled "Financial Audit of the National Institutes of Health's Management and Service and Supply Funds," the report follows a 1991 internal inquiry at NIH that failed to locate millions of dollars of computers, instruments, and lab equipment [SGR, January 15, 1992]. The report to the Inspector General notes a discrepancy of \$3.6 million in a pharmaceutical inventory reported at \$9.4 million, and questioned the accuracy of property and equipment reports "because of lack of accounting controls." Plus much more.

Technology Policy

(Continued from Page 3)

instead be allocated more generously to agencies such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NASA, the national energy labs, or the National Institutes of Health, all of whom seem poised to pursue critical technologies with entrepreneurial vigor and enthusiasm."

In the year that has passed since Clinton's election, he has publicly spoken several times of the role of technology in industrial rejuvenation, reiterating themes that he stressed during the campaign. On science, he's been silent, except for a few hurried, unrevealing comments at the White House ceremony last month for recipients of the National Medals of Science and Technology.

Money is the measure. The Pentagon is putting some \$500 million this year into the Technology Reinvestment Program, designed to spur the development of dual-use, civilian-military technologies by industrial firms and consortia that can include universities, state and local agencies, and federal labs. Costs are shared by the government and the other participants.

With the first round of awards, announced last month,

drawing about 2800 proposals, it's apparent that there's a lot of interest out there on the technological landscape, and that there's a vigorous constituency for this kind of program.

Among the winners announced so far is a consortium to develop a pilot production line for large format manufacturing of multi-chip modules. The partners are Hughes, Micro Module Systems, IMB, nChip, Motorola, Texas Instruments, Sandia National Laboratories, and Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International. Another \$500 million is slated for the Technology Reinvestment Program next year.

Science has slipped on the scale of federal priorities. The Super Collider perished of many causes, including several wounds unintentionally inflicted by the arrogant noblemen of high-energy physics. The Clinton White House dutifully appealed for Congressional support for the project, but not with any great fervor or application of Presidential muscle. It is difficult to avoid the impression of relief at the White House that this burdensome inheritance from the Reagan-Bush era is finally gone.

The leaders of the scientific professions and the seekers of research grants feel the chill that now exists in Washington. But so far, they have been unable to mobilize a response or obtain a hearing at the White House.—DSG

Super Collider Perishes in an Oratorical Miasma

For piquant dialog and free-running bombast on money, science, and government, honors belong to the October 19 House debate that killed the Superconducting Super Collider. Following are excerpts from that session, in which anti-SSC forces, sure of victory, ran oratorically wild, and then finished off the project with a 282-143 vote.

Rep. Jim Slattery (D-Kansas). We are talking about real money. As has already been pointed out, \$9 to \$10 billion can be saved for the American taxpayers by eliminating the Super Collider. So when my friends say we are not going to save very much money, I disagree; \$9 to \$10 billion is a lot of money.... California taxpayers, listen to us. This project is going to cost California taxpayers \$1.5 billion; Georgia taxpayers, \$254 million; Illinois taxpayers, \$572 million; Kansas taxpayers, \$104 million....

That is their state's share of what this monstrosity is going to cost.... We were [originally] told it was going to cost \$4.4 billion. Wrong. The cost estimate then went up to \$5.9 billion and then \$8.25 billion, and then to \$11 billion, and now some people are saying it is going to cost \$13 billion. And now the Secretary of Energy tells us, "We don't know what it is going to cost."

Are we going to continue to be big suckers or not? Now, in addition to that, we were told that we were going to get \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. We could not find enough suckers around the world to step up.

Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wisconsin). We are hemorrhaging expenditures in [the] Superconducting Super Collider. This project does not deserve another year's grace.... The time has come to say, "Enough is enough on this project." We are going to have to stand up, be tall, be consistent, and be counted....

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-California). What is the purpose of this \$11 billion project? When we have interviewed the scientists on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the answer I get from them is, "We are spending this money to get a better understanding of the universe." Eleven billion dollars for a better understanding of the universe. With the \$11 billion ... we could build a fusion energy plant that would develop this new technology and give something real to mankind. We could develop technology that would make the air cleaner, or we could bring down the level of deficit spending.... Talk about being doomed, we are doomed, our economy is doomed, if we cannot get ourselves to say no to projects like this that are totally unnecessary.

Rep. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio). This House voted overwhelmingly, 280 to 141, [in June] to kill funding for the SSC.... Unfortunately, because of parliamentary trickery, this Jurassic pork is far from being extinct.... Witness after witness came in and talked about huge cost overruns, and fraud, and abuse, and waste in this, the largest pork project in this government.... Mr. Speaker, I am part of the freshman

class which ran for Congress pledging to cut government waste. We can go home in our districts and talk about cutting a nickel here ... and a little there, but, Mr. Speaker, voting no on this project is the way to send a message that we in fact are serious about cutting waste. If we mean it, it is time to put up or shut up.

Rep. Christopher Shays (R-Connecticut). We are going to spend \$11 billion on basic research for the Superconducting Super Collider, but we cannot own that basic research. We cannot patent it.... We will have spent \$11 billion on the research while the Japanese and Western European nations will spend their money on commercializing what we spent a fortune to learn.

Rep. Jim Chapman (D-Texas). I think if we put it in terms of cost [of the SSC], we can look at the per capita cost to American citizens of less than 3 cents a year.... We worry about the North American Free Trade Agreement ... but a vote to kill the Super Collider eliminates over 15,000 jobs in America, high tech, science, engineering jobs, destroys the dreams of students in 200 universities across this country.... My colleagues, heart transplants cost \$5000 less today because of the Superconducting Super Collider research.

Rep. Slattery. Last time I checked, the population of this country was about 250 million. So, simple arithmetic tells me that the cost for next year [\$650 million] alone will be \$2.60 per citizen. It is that kind of math that has gotten us in the mess we are in today.

Rep. Joe Barton (R-Texas). Another important point to ponder is that the scientists that are building the SSC guarantee success. It is not like the space program back in the 60s where we hoped to make it to the moon. SSC leaders guarantee that in the energy range of the Super Collider ... they are going to find some answers to some basic questions that mankind has been trying to answer for thousands of years. They guarantee that they will do that.

Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert (R-New York). For those of you who are concerned about the future health of America, let me point out that while we are going ahead with this turkey ... two out of three applications for assistance, worthy applications to the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation, from investigators, from scientists who have great promise, are going unfunded.

We can't give them the bucks because we are spending it all on this. Mr. Speaker, we said we are going to have foreign contributions. We have not got the first yen, not the first deutsche mark, not the first peso. We are not getting foreign contributions.

Rep. Peter Hoagland (D-Nebraska). Do we Nebraskans feel that the Super Collider is essential enough to the future of our country now to tax ourselves over \$62 million? It may be desirable, but is it essential in a time when we are borrowing nearly a billion dollars a day to finance the federal government's activities? I think not, Mr. Speaker. We should all vote "no."

Psychiatric Association Asked to Reveal Top Salaries

SGR's annual publication of executive salaries at selected non-profit scholarly and professional associations has inspired an internal movement for fiscal *glasnost* at the American Psychiatric Association (APA), whose pay scales made the SGR list this year for the first time [SGR, March 15].

A recommendation for publication of APA salaries in the organization's monthly paper, *Psychiatric News*, is scheduled for consideration at the semi-annual meeting of the 220-member APA Assembly, November 5-7, in Washington. The call for openness was initially approved by the Washington-area Council of the Association, which comprises 37,500 MD psychiatrists nationwide. If approved by the Assembly, the proposal will be considered by the APA's Board of Trustees. Similar efforts are not under way at other non-profits, as far as SGR knows.

The APA recommendation is contained in an "Action Paper" titled "APA Corporate Openness With Its Membership," submitted by Drs. Thomas E. Allen and Bruce Hershfield, representatives of the Maryland Psychiatric Society. Their intent, they state in the paper, is to assure that "compensation for APA Administrative staff is within a range acceptable to the membership and that important financial aspects of contracts with its highest employed officials are not concealed from the membership."

Noting public concern about senior remuneration in the public and private sectors, the paper states, "This has come about as a result of abuses that have come to light and these abuses are often the result of secrecy and/or of only a few individuals knowing what is done in this regard."

The Allen-Hershfield submission disavows "any aspersions upon anyone in the APA leadership now or in the past," stating that its purpose "is to take steps that will both reassure our membership and will reduce the potential for such abuses in the future." It goes on to note that SGR published the APA's senior salaries, and states: "It seems to us that if this information is available to outside sources it ought to first be known to our own membership."

The salary information is contained in tax records that non-profit organizations are required to make available upon request by anyone under a 1988 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code. The APA eventually handed over the stuff to SGR, but only after officials expressed astonishment at the request, balked, and demanded that it be put in writing. Then they produced files lacking the required information. Reminded of the law, they complied in the most grudging fashion that SGR has encountered in five years of surveying pay at scores of non-profits.

As is common in the non-profit community, the data were a bit out of date because of filing extensions. Filed in April 1992 for calendar year 1991, the APA tax return showed executive compensation (no benefits were listed) in the high-middle range of pay for big non-profits:

Melvin Sabshin, Medical Director, \$218,572.

Jay B. Cutler, Special Counsel, \$189,350.

Raymond Purkis, Director of Advertising, \$164,256.

Carolyn Robinowitz, Senior Deputy Medical Director, \$162,745.

Lawrence Hartman, APA President, was listed for \$22,100, which was described to SGR as a stipend for time lost from practice.

The APA salaries are roughly 10-20 percent above those paid by the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Psychological Association. They're somewhat above the scale of the American Chemical Society. But the salaries for the APA brass are mere poultry feed compared to the pay raked in at other non-profits.

At the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, President Purnell Choppin received \$450,000 in salary, plus \$100,000 in benefits in the year ending August 31, 1992. At the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, President Gerald J. Mossinghoff received \$415,000 compensation, plus \$17,850 in benefits for the year ending June 30, 1992. For the same year, the chief of the Association of American Medical Colleges, Robert Petersdorf, received \$310,000 and \$31,000 in benefits.

In any case, as the Assembly of the American Psychiatric Association weighs the merits of openness, it should understand that, whatever the outcome, SGR will be back in a few months, exercising its statutory right to scrutinize the APA's latest tax return.—DSG

Job Changes & Appointments

John Lyons, former Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, has been appointed Director of the Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, Md., a facility established last year to develop advanced technologies for the Army.

The White House has announced that it will nominate **Graham R. Mitchell**, Director of Planning and Forecasting for GTE Laboratories, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Technology Policy.

Christine Ervin, head of the Department of Energy's Oregon office, has been nominated to be DOE Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Correction

SGR [October 15] misidentified one of the two findings of scientific misconduct that Robert C. Gallo plans to appeal to the Departmental Appeals Board of the Department of Health and Human Services at a hearing scheduled to start November 8. Gallo is appealing a finding that he was uncooperative in sharing reagents with other AIDS researchers. As correctly reported in SGR, he is also appealing a finding that he published a misleading assertion about the progress of AIDS research at the Pasteur Institute. Three other findings of misconduct by Gallo have been dismissed by the Appeals Board on grounds of lack of evidence.

More IN PRINT: Super Computing, Tech Transfer

(Continued from Page 7)

(GPO Stock No. 052-003-01325-8; 92 pp., \$6), notes with disapproval the long-standing absence of a high-level federal body responsible for studying and advising on ethical issues arising from biomedical developments, such as interspecies organ transplants, life support for brain-dead patients, etc. The last effective group in this area was the influential National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, a Congressional creation that functioned from 1974-78. Several successors were nominally established, but were immobilized by anti-abortion zealots throughout the Reagan and Bush Administrations.

Noting that Washington has been absent from the field for over a decade, OTA observes, "Today, policy decision makers find themselves besieged with bioethical issues seeking resolution." After the requisite handwringing over whether, how, where, and for how much money, OTA ends up with "Congress should somehow provide a voice for biomedical ethics in public policy." Among those requesting the OTA report were Senator Edward Kennedy, who was influential in establishing the 1974-78 Commission, and Senator Mark O. Hatfield, ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee.

Pulling Together for Productivity: A Union-Management Initiative at US West, Inc. (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01344-4; 80 pp., \$5.50), against a background of major staff reductions in even profitable corporations, OTA reports favorably on the 1991 labor-management agreement at the Home and Personal Services Division of US West, Inc., one of seven regional holding companies created by the 1983 splitup of AT&T. But in an accompanying press release, OTA notes that following completion of the OTA report, US West announced plans to eliminate 9000 jobs, or 14 percent of its workforce.

The press release from OTA notes that the job cutting "underscores the fragility of high-wage, high-skill strategies which benefit society as well as companies." The report itself is generally upbeat about the industry-union compact, stating that the agreement, between US West, Inc., and the Communications Workers of America and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, "has led to a series of mutual decisions that have protected union members' jobs and reorganized their work in a way that increases worker and customer satisfaction and that benefits the firm."

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/783-3238; fax 202/512-2250; add 25 percent for foreign orders.

From Desktop to Teraflop: Exploiting the US Lead in High Performance Computing (56 pp., no charge), with lots of sales sizzle, a report to the National Science Board (NSB), policymaker for the National Science Foundation, by a panel chaired by Lewis Branscomb, a veteran of government and

industry, and head, since 1986, of the sci/tech policy program at the Kennedy School, Harvard University. Calling for a rapid acceleration of federal programs to boost the scope and accessibility of high-performance computing, the pitch commences with: "Many reports are prepared for the National Science Board and the National Science Foundation that make an eloquent plea for more resources for one discipline or another. This is not such a report. This report addresses an opportunity to accelerate progress in virtually every branch of science and engineering concurrently, while also giving a shot in the arm to the entire American economy...."

The Branscomb panel, drawn from academe and industry, included Neal Lane, Provost of Rice University, who was sworn in last month as Director of NSF.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Forms and Publications, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-7861. For information about electronic availability on NSF's Science and Technology Information System: request STIS Flyer (publication NSF 91-10), or get it by Internet E-mail: stisinfo@nsf.gov or by Bitnet, stisinfo@NSF.

Space Technology Innovation (20 pp., no charge), bi-monthly newsletter published by NASA's Office of Advanced Concepts and Technology, reporting technological developments that may have commercial potential. Contacts for the various items are provided, and there's also a list of NASA publications, forthcoming meetings on technology transfer, and news items about various related programs at the space agency.

Order from: Space Technology Innovation, NASA, Code C, 300 E St. SW, Washington, DC 20546.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$425.00 ☐
two years, \$730.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface
mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

IN PRINT: Industrial R&D, Public Health, Integrity

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

Enhancing American Competitiveness: A Progress Report to the President and Congress (33 pp., no charge), from the Competitiveness Policy Council, a 12-member bipartisan body authorized in 1988 by Congressional Democrats to stir up the Republican White House. The Council is still around, issuing reports that draw little attention, mainly because its goal—a bigger government role in industrial affairs—is now mainstream ideology in Washington. The noteworthy item in this one comes from its Critical Technologies Subcouncil, chaired by former NSF Director Erich Bloch, a Distinguished Fellow at an outfit with a similar name, the private Council on Competitiveness. Reflecting how far advocacy of “industrial policy” has come since George Bush slunk off to Houston, Bloch’s Subcouncil calls for expanding the industrial roles of NIH, the Pentagon’s Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), and the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, saying they should be authorized “to purchase equity or extend loans/loan guarantees to help support commercialization of promising technologies developed through their contracts.” Under Bush, the chief of what was then DARPA, Craig Fields, was fired for doing just that. Clinton’s policy on this practice has not been specifically enunciated, but so far, it seems almost anything goes in the Administration’s gung-ho drive to boost high-tech industry. Fields, now chief of the industrial consortium Microelectronics and Computer Corporation, is a member of Bloch’s Subcouncil, as is John Deutch, DOD chief for Acquisition.

Order from: Competitiveness Policy Council, 11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 650, Washington, DC 20036-1207; tel. 202/387-9017; fax 202/328-6312.

Evaluation of R&D: A Canadian newsletter on the evaluation of research and development (16 pp., no charge), a diverse collection of articles and odd bits in a publication “Supported by the Government Review Division, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat” and labeled “Written and edited by practicing R&D evaluators and managers from both private and public sectors.” The summer 1993 issue (Vol. I, No. 3), includes reports on the Interuniversity Center for Research on Science and Technology, an affiliate of the University of Quebec; the US National Science Foundation’s year-old program of research on science and technology “inputs, processes, outputs, and impacts;” the staff-promotion system at the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Canada’s program for linking academic centers of excellence to promote industrial competitiveness. Articles are accompanied by names and numbers for obtaining additional information.

Order from: *Evaluation of R&D*, 10th Floor, West Tower, L’Esplanade Laurier, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R5, Canada; fax 613/957-7240.

Health of the Public: A Challenge to Academic Health Centers—Strategies for Reorienting Academic Health Centers Toward Community Health Needs (113 pp., no charge), reports from 17 academic health centers participating in a program founded in 1986 by the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Rockefeller Foundation to develop community-oriented health-care programs. Many of the schools discuss “what did and did not work,” with Johns Hopkins spotlighting a major problem with its comment: “The greatest difficulty to date has been to provide a wide range of experiences in preventive medicine in a 4 to 6 week block of time.”

A section titled “Tips for Working with the Media” wisely advises: “Don’t argue with reporters. Anything you say can be quoted.” (Or misquoted, it should be added.) The volume was edited by Professors Arthur Kaufman and Robert E. Waterman, University of New Mexico School of Medicine.

Order from: Health of the Public Program Office, 735 Parnas Ave., attn. Jonathan Showstack, San Francisco, California 94143-0994; tel. 415/476-8097; fax 415/476-4329.

Integrity in Biomedical Research (102 pp., \$25, plus \$6 for shipping), a special supplement to the September issue of *Academic Medicine*, journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Washington-based shill for mainstream medical schools in Congress and environs. The supplement, containing 20 articles, opens with its editor, Paul J. Friedman, UC San Diego, School of Medicine, recklessly asking: “Is there anything new to be said about research integrity?” Apparently not.

Order from: Publication Orders, Association of American Medical Colleges, 2450 N St. NW, Washington, DC 20037; tel. 202/828-0416.

Harmful Non-Indigenous Species in the United States (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01347-9; 391 pp., \$21), from the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a major study, over two years in preparation, on plants, animals, insects, etc., of foreign origin that are causing problems of one sort or another on American territory. Examples cited range from kudzu to feral goats. Estimating the total of free-living non-indigenous species in the US at 4500 or more, OTA says about 15 percent of them cause “severe harm,” almost all states are affected, and the costs in crop losses, disease, environmental problems and other factors run to billions of dollars.

While the problems appear to be worsening, the report says, federal efforts to exclude harmful species are a confusing and largely ineffective patchwork. OTA shuns explicit recommendations. But, warning that the invaders “are creating a growing economic and environmental burden for the country,” it nods favorably at “prompt Congressional action to create a more stringent national policy.”

Also from OTA: *Biomedical Ethics in US Public Policy*

(Continued on Page 7)

